

UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER
AD840005
NEW LIMITATION CHANGE
TO Approved for public release, distribution unlimited
FROM Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Administrative/Operational Use; 07 MAY 1964. Other requests shall be referred to U.S. Army Biological Lab., Fort Detrick, MD 21701.
AUTHORITY
AMXFD ltr, 9 Feb 1972

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

TRANSLATION NO. 1080

DATE: 7 May 1964

DDC AVAILABILITY NOTICE

Reproduction of this publication in whole or in part is prohibited. However, DDC is authorized to reproduce the publication for United States Government purposes.

STATEMENT #2 UNCLASSIFIED

This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of Dept. of Army, Fort Detrick, ATTN: Technical Release Branch/TID, Frederick, Maryland 21701

DDC
R
SEP 26 1968
RELEASE
A

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
Fort Detrick
Frederick, Maryland

AD840005

TEST REPORT NUMBER 715 OF TEST STATION 53

Following is a translation of a German-language document issued by Test Station 53 of the Armed Forces of the Federal Republic of Germany (Bundeswehr), 3042 Munster-Lager, Germany, telephone Munster-Lager 2831/583, dated 26 June 1963.

Testing Assignment

Subject: Sampling Equipment for Biological Warfare Agents.
Comparison Between:

1. Sampling Kit for Biological Agents, of the Firm Bartels & Rieger, Cologne, and
2. US Sampling Kit, Biological Agent, Equipment Set E 25 R 2.

Reference: 1. Testing Assignment PT 356 - PT III 1 - 41/P 1174/001/2, dated 2 July 1962
2. Testing Assignment PT 357 - PT III 1/01/4272 - 102/2, dated 28 June 1962
3. Test Report Number 699 of Test Station 53, dated 30 May 1963
4. Test Report Number 712 of Test Station 53, dated 14 June 1963
5. Letter from BWB Coblenz, dated 9 April 1963, to Federal Ministry of Defense T III 7 (Doc Log No PT III 2 - P 1174/59 A)

Reporting: Doctor of Medicine and Veterinarian von Spreckhoff

Test Report Number 715 of Test Station 53 - V 16/63
(1st Comparison Report)

The Dräger pump of the German sampling equipment and the vacuum pump of the American kit are suitable for taking air samples for the purpose of testing for germ content.

The US device has several advantages over the German device, however, these being:

1. Greater capacity (approximately 184 ml air per second (or less than one second), as compared to 100 ml per 10-12 seconds)
2. Its simpler operation requiring less expenditure of energy
3. The very probable longer life of the germs due to their transfer from the dry to the liquid phase.

/s/ Dr Buttler
/t/ Dr Buttler

/s/ Sprockhoff
/t/ Dr v. Sprockhoff

/s/ Kramer
/t/ Kramer

Bundeswehr Testing Station 53

3042 Munster-Lager, 26 June 1963

Doc Log No V1 - 72 - 22 - 66 - 65

Tel: Munster-Lager 2831/583

Test Report Number 715 of Test Station 53 - V 16/63
(1st Comparison Report)

Subject: Sampling Equipment for Biological Warfare Agents.
Comparison Between:

1. Sampling Kit for Biological Agents, of the Firm Bartels & Rieger, Cologne, and
2. US Sampling Kit, Biological Agent, Equipment Set E 25 R 2.

Reference: 1. Testing Assignment PT 356 - PT III 1 - 41/P 1174/001/2, dated 2 July 1962

2. Testing Assignment PT 357 - PT III 1/01/427 Z - 102/2, dated 28 June 1962

3. Test Report Number 699 of Test Station 53, dated 30 May 1963

4. Test Report Number 712 of Test Station 53, dated 14 June 1963

5. Letter from BWB Coblenz, dated 9 April 1963, to Federal Ministry of Defense T III 7 (Doc Log No PT III 2 - P 1174/59 A)

Reporting: Doctor of Medicine and Veterinarian von Sprockhoff

A) Equipment Tested:

1. Sampling equipment for biological warfare agents of the firm Bartels & Rieger, Cologne, and
2. US Sampling kit, biological agent, equipment set E 25 R 2.

B) Purpose of Test:

The test is to yield a comparison between the two sets of equipment.

C) Conduct of the Test:

The comparison tests consisted of the examination of experimentally produced *Serratia marcescens* aerosols with the help of the German Dräger pump and the vacuum pump component of the American equipment.

Additional details on the breeding of the test germ *Serratia marcescens* ("Bacterium prodigiosum"), on producing

the aerosol with the Piccolo device of the firm C. Heyer, Bad Ems, and on the filtration can be found in the two test reports referenced above (see references 3 and 4).

The time intervals of the samplings can be seen from the record, which are not included in this report. Continuous sampling was conducted.

D) Results of Tests:

The tests results for both sets of equipment are compared in Tables 1-3. In all tests, the individual samples are numbered serially as well as -- for simpler comparison with the corresponding sample numbers in the tables of the test reports referenced above -- individually.

The results can be evaluated in the following sense:

Test 1: Very good agreement in the number of germs identified

Test 2: Also very good agreement in the samples taken during the fogging. After the fogging, identification of germs with the Dräger pump was initially good, later -- corresponding to the increasing sedimentation of the bacteria -- quite limited. Only scattered Serratia germs could be detected with the US pump after termination of the fogging.

Test 3: Dräger pump -- only a few or no germs at all detected
US pump -- initially, considerably more bacteria detected than with the German pump with approximately equal volumes of air, later only scattered germs or none at all.

Test 4: Relatively good agreement on all samples

Test 5: Very good agreement on all samples.

Test 6: Dräger pump -- initially, during the fogging, many germs; later, after termination of the fogging, few to scattered Serratia bacteria detected

US pump -- on the whole, numerous bacteria detected and almost always more than with the German equipment.

Table 1. Results of Tests 1 and 2.

Test 1					Test 2				
Sample No.		German pump		US pump		Sample No.		German pump	
Taken With:		Air		Air		Taken With:		Air	
Drager pump	US pump	1	Colonies	1	Colonies	Drager pump	US pump	1	Colonies
1	1		complete coverage			1	1		10 complete coverage
2	1			10	complete coverage	2	1	2	complete coverage
3	2	2	complete coverage			3		2	complete coverage
4	2			10	complete coverage	4	2	1	complete coverage
5	3	5	complete coverage			5		3	complete coverage
6	3			20	complete coverage	6	3	0.5	complete coverage
7	4	5	complete coverage			7		4	
8	4			1.8	complete coverage	8	4	0.1	complete coverage
9	5	1	complete coverage			9			0.9 complete coverage
10	5			1.8	complete coverage	10			0.9 complete coverage
11	6	2	complete coverage			11			0.18 complete coverage
12	6			9.2	complete coverage	12	5	1	complete coverage
13	7			0.9	complete coverage	13	6	0.1	complete coverage
14	7	2	complete coverage			14	7	0.1	complete coverage
15	8			5	complete coverage	15	8	0.5	complete coverage
16	8	1	complete coverage			16	9	0.5	complete coverage
17	9			0.9	complete coverage	17	10	0.1	220

14	7	2	complete coverage		14	7	0.1 complete coverage		
15	8			5 complete coverage	15	8	0.5 complete coverage		
16	8	1	complete coverage		16	9	0.5 complete coverage		
17	9			0.9 complete coverage	17	10	0.1 220		
18	9	1	complete coverage		18	8		0.18	2
19	10	3	complete coverage		19	11	0.2 130		
20	10			1.8 ca. 750	20	9		0.18	0
21	11	1	complete coverage		21	12	0.5 129		
22	11			5 95	22	10		0.9	3
23	12	5	complete coverage		23	13	1 34		
					24	14	0.1 6		
					25	15	0.5 6		
					26	16	1 7		
					27	11		5	2

GC = ca. $4 \cdot 10^8$

GC = ca. $1 \cdot 10^8$

Samples taken during aeration:

German pump 1-10 US pump 1-9 German pump 1-8 US pump 1-7

Samples taken following aeration:

German pump 11-12 US pump 10-11 German pump 9-16 US pump 8-11

GC = Germ count in 1 ml bacteria concentrate

= Marks line dividing samples taken during and after aeration

11	6	0	11	6	3.7	170
12	6	0.9	12	1	30	
13	7	3	13	7	1.6	150
14	7	3	14	2	25	
15	8	0	15	8	3	175
16	8	5	16	1	40	
17	9	10	17	9	5	140
18	10	5	18	2	20	
19	11	0	19	10	10	14
20	11	0.0	20	2	12	
			21	11	20	5
			22	4	14	

GC = ca. $6.6 \cdot 10^9$

GC = ca. $6 \cdot 10^{13}$

Samples taken during aeration:			
German pump 1-2	US pump 1	German pump 1-3	US Pump 1-3
Samples taken following aeration:			
German pump 3-9	US pump 2-11	German pump 4-11	US pump 4-11

Table 3. Results of Tests 5 and 6.

Sample 1				Test				Sample No.				Sample 6			
Taken With:				US Pump				Taken With:				US Pump			
Drager pump	US pump	Air i	Agar Colonies	Drager pump	US pump	Air i	Agar Colonies	Drager pump	US pump	Air i	Agar Colonies	Drager pump	US pump	Air i	Agar Colonies
1	1			1	1	0.18	ca. 1500	1	1	0.1	4				
2	1	0.1	complete coverage	2	2			2	2	0.5	17				
3	2			3	3	0.9	ca. 1630	3	3	1	121				
4	2	0.5	complete coverage	4	4			4	4					0.9	complete coverage
5	3			5	5	1.8	complete coverage	5	5	1	complete coverage				
6	4			6	6	0.9	complete coverage	6	6	2				3.7	complete coverage
7	5			7	7	5	complete coverage	7	7	3				0.9	141
8	3	2	complete coverage	8	8			8	8	0.5	9				
9	6			9	9	5	complete coverage	9	9	4				1.8	18
10	4	0.5	complete coverage	10	10			10	10	1	11				
11	5	1	complete coverage	11	11			11	11	5				5	42
12	6	2	complete coverage	12	12			12	12	0.1	3				
13	7			13	13	0.5	complete coverage	13	13	0.5	2				
14	7			14	14	1	complete coverage	14	14	1	9				
15	8			15	15	1.5	complete coverage	15	15	6				1.8	760
16	8	2	complete coverage	16	16			16	16	0.5	5				
17	9			17	17	5	complete coverage	17	17	7				0.18	71
18	10			18	18	10	complete coverage	18	18	8				0.9	2
19	11			19	19	20	complete coverage	19	19	5				1.8	7
20	9	4	complete coverage	20	20			20	20	11	3				
										10				10	240

A

11	5	1	complete coverage	11	5	5	42
12	6	2	complete coverage	12	7	3	
13	7	3	complete coverage	13	8	2	
14	8	4	complete coverage	14	9	9	
15	9	5	complete coverage	15	10	1.8	765
16	10	6	complete coverage	16	11	5	
17	11	7	complete coverage	17	12	0.18	71
18	12	8	complete coverage	18	13	0.9	2
19	13	9	complete coverage	19	14	1.8	7
20	14	10	complete coverage	20	15	3	
21	15	11	complete coverage	21	16	10	234
22	16	12	complete coverage	22	17	2	
23	17	13	complete coverage	23	18	5	ca. 4
24	18	14	complete coverage	24	19	1	

GC not determinable

($> 10^{13}$)

GC not determinable ($> 10^{13}$)

Samples taken during aeration

German pump 1-7 US Pump 1-7 German pump 1-4 US pump 1-2

Samples taken following aeration

German pump 8-11 US pump 8-11 German pump 5-13 US pump 3-11

5) Discussion:

A comparison of the test results indicates the suitability of the German Dräger pump and the American vacuum pump for taking air samples and detecting the germs contained therein, under the conditions prevailing during these tests. A good to very good agreement can be noted in Tests 1, 4 and 5.

Of the remaining tests, part speak in favor of the German, part in favor of the US pump. The reasons for these discrepancies is perhaps to be found in several factors. First, the method of functioning of the two pumps is different. The Dräger pump filters the air through dry membrane filters; the germs collect on the surface and in the pores of the filter and can grow after making contact with a nutrient medium. The method of air sampling with the US device is based upon the Impinger effect. The vacuum pump draws the germs through fine slots located in the side walls of plastic containers in which a liquid (nutrient bouillon, salt solution or the like) is held. They are thus transferred from the dry into the liquid phase.

Secondly, since all the tests were conducted in an improvised chamber set up in an air shaft in the laboratory, various convection or electrostatic conditions which cannot be more closely defined at the present time might have had their effects. Uncertainties of this type can only be eliminated when working with a special aerosol chamber. It is planned that such a chamber will be secured in the future, and the tests reported here might then be repeated.

Advantages of the American equipment, certainly, are the high pump capacity of ca. 184 ml air per revolution, the ease of operation of this vacuum pump and the utilization of the Impinger effect in the form of a transfer of the germs from the dry to the liquid phase. The latter feature, as indicated by other experiments (Goetz, Albrecht), provides greater probability of survival of the germs. Furthermore, the germ-seeded liquid can be placed on several types of nutrient carton in order to bring about a differentiation of the isolated germs.

These points seem to indicate the advisability of using the US vacuum pump for the examination of aerosols and germ-laden air, as well as water and surface samples.

The immediate contact with a nutrient medium is also advantageous for furnishing an early favorable environment for the microorganisms if brooding in an incubator is to take place and this also enables a more rapid diagnosis than in the case of the possible lengthy transfer from the sampling site to the laboratory, as is envisaged with the German equipment.

One possible source of difficulty must be mentioned, however. It is very possible that the material to be sampled (air, surface material) might be contaminated with ubiquitously distributed microorganisms (cf. Test 5) such as *Proteus vulgaris*, *Bacillus mesentericus*, *Bacillus subtilis*, etc. In this case, the immediate processing of the samples by transfer into the liquid phase might be accompanied by a disturbance in the germ differentiation due to the inundation with foreign germs. It should be possible to eliminate such circumstances, however, by adding germ-inhibiting substances (inhibition of swarming bacteria such as *Proteus*, *Pseudomonas* and *Clostridia*) in the form of surface-active materials (Pril, Rei, Paranitrophenyl-glycerine) suggested by the authors Döll and Beer; also by addition of antibiotics (i.e., streptomycin as an inhibitor of Gram-negative and Penicillin as an inhibitor of Gram-positive bacteria, Nystatin as an inhibitor of fungus).

F) Summary:

The Dräger pump of the German sampling equipment and the vacuum pump of the American equipment are suitable for taking air samples to examine their germ content.

The US equipment, however, has several advantages over the German equipment. These consist

→ (1) of the greater capacity (ca. 184 ml air/1 or second compared to 100 ml in 10-12 seconds);

(2) of the simpler -- i.e., energy saving operation;

(3) and very probably longer or better chance of life for the germs due to the transfer from the dry to the liquid phase. () ←

G) Bibliography:

Albrecht, J: "Methods of Identification of Microorganisms in Aerosol Form," Zeitschrift für Aerosolforschung (Journal of Aerosol Research), Vol 7, 1958, pages 1-12.

Beer, J: "A New Chemical Agent Which Inhibits the Swarming of Bacteria, PN PG/1," Zentralblatt für Bakteriologie (Central Bulletin on Bacteriology), I Original, Vol 171, 1958, pages 195-200.

Döll, W: "Additional Experiments on Inhibition of Swarming of *Proteus* Bacteria Through Substances Which Lower Interface Tension," Zentralblatt für Bakteriologie (Central Bulletin on Bacteriology), I Original, Vol 171, 1958, pages 151-152.

Goetz, A:

"Basic Problems in the Detection of Microbiological Air Pollution," American Industrial Hygiene Association quarterly, Vol 16, 1955, pages 113-120.

/s/ Sprockhoff

/t/ Dr v. Sprockhoff